



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,460	03/01/2004	Yigal Beckerano	29250-000999/US	9258
32498 7590 03/18/2008 CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC P.O. BOX 1995 VIENNA, VA 22183				
EXAMINER				
TORRES, MARCOS L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ADVISORY ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2-22-08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Regarding applicant argument that Ayyagari does not disclose or suggest assigning slot to a divided CFP, because the CFP have duration of 6ms and the CFP in fig. 2 and 4 are not divided onto slots; it is noted that the claim does require a time slot of a specific duration and Ayyagari shows a contention free period (CFP) that consist in two timeslot of 6ms each, which the two time slot of 6ms are assigned for two different BTS (see fig. 2 and 4). Thereby, the contention free period is divided into slots and assigned to different BTS. Moreover, the claim recite "dividing a Contention-Free Period (CFP) into one or more slots", dividing the contention free period into one slot could not even be considered to be divided since a division by one is the whole number/unit, thereby the arguments presented by the applicant are not required by the claim. And even arguendo that the claim would disclose dividing a slot in several subslots (which is still not being claim) Ayyagari further teaches that time slot can be divided in timeslots of 3ms in fig. 6).
3. Regarding applicant argument directed to the differences of the CFP of the present application and the Ayyagari reference; CFP is being interpreted as recited in the claims, any difference from the specification are not going to be read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
4. Therefore, the current rejection in record stands.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCOS L. TORRES whose telephone number is (571)272-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-252-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marcos L. Torres/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/M. L. T./